EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW	YORK	
GUS GAGASOULES, et al.,	A	
Plai	intiffs,	ODDED
-against-		ORDER CV 08-2409(ADS)(ARL)
MBF LEASING, LLC, et al.,		
Def	endants.	
LINDSAY, Magistrate Judge:	A	

Before the court is the plaintiffs' letter application seeking reconsideration of the court's August 9, 2010 order. By letter dated June 14, 2010, the plaintiffs sought "appropriate orders under Rule 37" given the defendants' alleged failure to respond to their requests dated February 2009 and February 2010. In denying the request, the court noted that the plaintiffs' requests had already been the subject of a number of applications and, based on the parties' discussions during prior conferences, as well as the information contained in the defendants' June 23, 2010 opposition, the relief sought was not warranted. The court also advised the plaintiffs that, if they wished to represent their applications of the plaintiffs of the plaintiffs that, if they

prior conferences, as well as the information contained in the defendants' June 23, 2010 opposition, the relief sought was not warranted. The court also advised the plaintiffs that, if they wished to renew their application after looking at the defendants' database, they would be required to set forth the specific requests and the corresponding responses that they believed were deficient. Although the plaintiffs are correct that the court failed to specifically address the plaintiffs' February 2010 interrogatories in the August 9th order, the court's ruling remains unchanged. The court cannot address the defendants' alleged deficiency until the plaintiffs set forth, in a three-page letter motion, the specific interrogatories and/or documents requests and the corresponding responses that they believe are deficient. The court cannot make a determination based on the plaintiffs' general references to the defendants responses nor will it rely on the plaintiffs' reply letter dated July 13th.